Remarks

In the present response, twenty five claims (1-7, 9, 11, 13-17, 20-27, 29-30, and 32) are amended, seven claims are original (8, 10, 12, 18-19, 28, and 31), and one claim ("second" 19) is canceled. Claims 1-32 are presented for examination. Applicants believe that no new matter is entered.

I. Specification Objection (Abstract)

The Abstract is objected to because it contains informalities. The Abstract is canceled, and a new Abstract is submitted.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 19-20 are objected to because claims 19, 19 appear twice. The "second" claim 19 is canceled.

III. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, claims 1 and 26-27 contain the phrase "such as" and/or "so as to" and/or "so as to." Further, claim 30 contains the phrase "for example" and/or "that of applications" and "fine-grained control."

Each of these claims is amended to correct the rejections.

IV. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Reinhardt et al. (USPN 5,598,565, hereinafter Reinhardt). This rejection is traversed

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Reinhardt neither teaches nor suggests each element in claims 1-32, these claims are allowable over Reinhardt.

Claim 1 (Emphasis Added)

1. A method for reducing energy consumption of a display in a computer system, comprising:

profiling screen usage patterns and their impact on energy consumption by the display;

deriving an energy model based on the screen usage patterns;

determining when to control the display in order to decrease its energy consumption;

determining which screen portions of the display and what display parameters to control **based on the energy model**; and

for each portion of the display to be controlled, controlling its display parameters, wherein the screen portions are controlled to attain energy conservation.

Independent claim 1 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Reinhardt. Examples of these limitations are emphasized above in claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites "profiling screen usage patterns and their impact on energy consumption by the display." Reinhardt does not teach or suggest such a limitation. Further, the claim recites "deriving an energy model based on the screen usage patterns." Reinhardt does not teach or suggest such a limitation.

Dependent claims 2-25 depend from claim 1 and thus inherit all the limitations of base claim 1. As such, claims 2-25 are also allowable over Reinhardt. Further, these dependent claims contain numerous limitations not taught or suggested in Reinhardt.

Claims 26 and 27

For at least the reasons given in connection with claim 1, independent claims 26 and 27 are allowable over Reinhardt.

Dependent claims 28-29 depend from claim 27 and thus inherit all the limitations of base claim 27. As such, claims 28-29 are also allowable over Reinhardt. Further, these dependent claims contain numerous limitations not taught or suggested in Reinhardt.

Claim 30 (Emphasis Added)

30. A system for energy-aware software control in a computer system, comprising:

a central processing unit (CPU);

a memory embodying program code to be fetched and executed by the CPU;

a display capable of supporting control of screen portions via their respective display parameters;

a user interface, the display and user interface being directly or indirectly controlled by the CPU;

a monitor configured to monitor power metrics of a computer system power source;

an energy model creator using as an input profiling parameters to create an energy model; and

an energy-aware software control means capable of controlling the respective display parameters of the screen portions **based on the energy model**.

Independent claim 30 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Reinhardt. Examples of these limitations are emphasized above in claim 30. For example, claim 30 recites "an energy model creator using as an input profiling parameters to create an energy model." Reinhardt does not teach or suggest such a limitation.

Dependent claims 31-32 depend from claim 30 and thus inherit all the limitations of base claim 1. As such, claims 31-32 are also allowable over Reinhardt. Further, these dependent claims contain numerous limitations not taught or suggested in Reinhardt.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant believes claims 1-32 are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. (281) 514-8236, Facsimile No. (281) 514-8332. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 281-514-8236

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 5/10/04 day of May, 2004.

By Be Henry
Name: Be Henry